

A14 ELLINGTON TO FEN DITTON IMPROVEMENT SCHEME DRAFT ORDERS

To: **Cabinet**

Date: **15th December 2009**

From: **Executive Director: Environment Services**

Electoral division(s): **All - due to implications of diversionary routes etc.**

Forward Plan ref: **2009 / 009** *Key Decision:* **Yes**

Purpose: **To inform Cabinet of the implications of the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme draft Orders published by the Highways Agency, and to determine the County Council's response to those draft Orders.**

Recommendation: **It is recommended that Members:**

- 1. reaffirm overall support for the A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton scheme and seek its early implementation,**
- 2. review and confirm the scope of the objections listed in Appendix 1 to this report,**
- 3. support the provision of a half junction (west facing slip roads) on the A1198 at the future A14 crossing,**
- 4. authorise the advertisement in early 2010 of appropriate traffic regulation orders (TROs) on County roads along the route of the scheme and in the Huntingdon area, for the Cabinet's own final determination,**
- 5. delegate to the Lead Member for Highways and Access in consultation with the Executive Director: for Environment Services, authority for approving the scope of the TROs,**
- 6. authorise officer attendance at the prospective Public Inquiries to present the County Council's case,**
- 7. delegate to the three Lead Members (for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning; Highways and Access; Economy and Environment) in consultation with the Executive Director Environment Services authority to make any detailed changes to the objections and negotiate any withdrawal of objections.**

Officer Contact:		Member contact	
Name:	Bob Tuckwell / John Clough / Janet Martin.	Name:	Cllr. Roy Pegram.
Post:	Strategic Transport Adviser / Senior Programme Manager / Local Environment Manager	Portfolio:	Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning
Email:	Bob.Tuckwell@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk John.Clough@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk Janet.Martin@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Roy.Pegram@Cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715488/ 699911/ 715684	Tel:	07979 960140

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The current proposals for the improvement of the A14, by the Highways Agency form a key recommendation of the Government's A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Multi-Modal Study (CHUMMS), which was published in August 2001. That Study which was supported by widespread consultation, advocated a multi-modal range of transport solutions (its Preferred Plan) to the traffic problems of the A14 corridor.
- 1.2 These solutions included a guided busway system between Huntingdon and Cambridge using the former Cambridge to St Ives rail line along with Park and Ride facilities (now nearing completion), the upgrading of the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail line to cater for modern container freight traffic, further traffic demand management in Cambridge and traffic calming in villages and Market Towns.
- 1.3 For the improvement of the A14 itself, the main scheme was identified as needing to provide for a new free flow route between Ellington and Fen Ditton, built to a three lane dual carriageway standard. Between Ellington and Fen Drayton, the route should be an off-line alignment south of Brampton and Godmanchester. The remainder of the scheme would involve widening on the existing route between Fen Drayton and Girton, including parallel local access roads for local traffic. Between Fen Drayton and Huntingdon, the existing A14 would be downgraded for local traffic and public transport, with access to Huntingdon town centre and the railway station. To achieve this, the CHUMMS scheme implied the need for the removal of the Huntingdon viaduct.
- 1.4 The CHUMMS Study believed full consideration should be given to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians in the design of highway and public transport schemes, along with full environmental assessments to minimise the impact of the project development. The CHUMMS Study also recognised that there were opportunities for better integration of land use and transport in the corridor as part of the growth agenda and this has subsequently happened with the identification of Northstowe as the new settlement and prospective developments in Cambridge and Huntingdon.
- 1.5 Since 2002, the Highways Agency has in consultation with the Local Authorities been developing its proposals for the improvement of the A14 between Ellington and Fen Ditton. The CHUMMS Study was of necessity undertaken at a strategic level and as with the design and development of the

Cambridgeshire Guided Busway by the County Council, the outline concept of the improvement of the A14 has had to be turned into a deliverable project.

- 1.6 The draft Orders for the scheme were published by the Highways Agency on the 30th September 2009 and the period for objections extends until the 6th January 2010. These draft Orders include:
- The new A14 Mainline Order,
 - The Side Road Orders for altering and extending the existing County side roads, and new local access roads, including new local roads in Huntingdon Town Centre,
 - The De-trunking Orders for the old A14 probably from Fen Drayton to Alconbury, and Brampton to Spittals Interchange, which will subject to negotiation, become the responsibility of the County Council,
 - Compulsory Purchase Orders for the above.
- 1.7 As a consequence of the scheme, the County Council will have to rescind and make a number of local Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), especially in Huntingdon Town Centre.

2. PREVIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THE A14 CHUMMS SCHEME

- 2.1 The County Council's Cabinet has considered the A14 proposals on four previous occasions at key development stages and has been supportive of the scheme throughout. The first occasion was on 25th September 2001, when the recommendations of the CHUMMS Study were broadly supported. In December 2001, the Secretary of State, without pre-empting any of the usual statutory and other consultative processes, invited the County Council to come forward with proposals for a guided busway scheme and asked the Highways Agency to undertake preparatory work on the preparation and development of the A14 improvements.
- 2.2 Subsequent feasibility work by the Agency led early in 2005 to a major public consultation on the potential scheme, in particular the detailed route of the off-line section(s). Here, the Agency, although having examined the feasibility of a range of routes, actively consulted on only one of them (the orange route), because it believed that it was the only deliverable route. Additionally, the consultation offered an "Alternative" option to the CHUMMS Study strategy. This provided only a two lane dual carriageway south of Brampton and Godmanchester and retained the current A14 alignment through Huntingdon as a through route and retaining the viaduct.
- 2.3 On the 14th June 2005, the Cabinet considered the Council's response to the consultation and was supportive of the orange route. However, it did not consider that sufficient investigation work had been undertaken to determine in fact whether the viaduct could be removed and the former A14 route connected satisfactorily into the Town Centre. Cabinet highlighted the need for a traffic, economic and environmental study into the potential of removing the viaduct. The County Council therefore led a study, the Huntingdon Viaduct Study, to investigate this and was financially supported by the Agency, Huntingdonshire District Council and others.

- 2.4 On 23rd May 2006, Cabinet considered the outcome of the Study that concluded that the CHUMMS Study strategy was viable and that the highway network in Huntingdon Town Centre could be modified to accommodate the removal of the viaduct. Environmentally, the CHUMMS strategy was also more beneficial to Huntingdon than the “Alternative” option.
- 2.5 Following the Highways Agency’s consultation exercise in 2005, the Offords Action Group mounted a legal challenge to the first consultation and selection of the orange route. In an out of court settlement, the Highways Agency undertook further consultation during late 2006 / early 2007 on the route south of Brampton and Godmanchester, offering a range of alternatives.
- 2.6 Following that further consultation, on 27th February 2007 Cabinet reviewed the alternative lines south of Brampton and Godmanchester and reaffirmed that it supported the orange route.
- 2.7 As a postscript to the Cabinet meetings of 14th June 2005 and 27th February 2007, the County Council organised two statements of support for the scheme, urging progress. A range of leading stakeholders and their organisations based in Cambridgeshire lent their names to the statements.
- 2.8 Subsequently, in March 2007 and October 2007, the Government made its Preferred Route Announcements for the Fen Drayton to Fen Ditton and Ellington to Fen Drayton Sections of the scheme respectively.

Measures Sought by the County Council

- 2.9 When the Cabinet supported the CHUMMS recommendations, it sought the following provision from Central Government:
- Upgrade the Felixstowe to Nuneaton Rail line for improved freight services: Government and private sector finance is in place, and some work is complete.
 - Traffic calming in villages: £4m obtained via the Local Transport Plan (LTP) for this work and schemes have been undertaken.
 - Completion of the A428 Caxton Common to Hardwick scheme (now completed) and A428 Caxton to St Neots Section (still awaiting design and a source of funding).
- 2.10 During the consideration of the scheme as it has been developed to this stage, the County Council has sought to have the following included in the scheme or further measures provided, (note that our assessment of progress is included):
- *Dual carriageway local access road from Girton to Fen Drayton.* This is now planned within the scheme.
 - *Provide a Swavesey junction for strategic traffic to access Cambridge Services.* This is planned within the scheme.
 - The omission of a junction with the A1198 was supported earlier. This stance will have to be reviewed in the light of new evidence supporting the provision of a west facing half junction.
 - *Provide an all movements junction at Girton.* This is not proposed as part of this scheme. Within this complex junction, allowance has to be made for possible additional links in the future. An A428 connection to the M11 will

have to be combined with a widening of the M11. The Agency believes that local links from the A14 east bound to A428 westbound would be uneconomic.

- *Provide a pedestrian cycle bridge at Histon.* This would be physically difficult to provide as a separate dedicated route but the Guided Busway scheme will offer a comparable route. Some improvement has been achieved with the recent widening of the Histon Road approach to the Interchange and further measures are being investigated.
- *Safeguarding and enhancement of Public Rights of Way.* Considerable work has been undertaken by the Joint Venture Consortium (see below), but more especially at Brampton could be achieved.
- *Need for maximum environmental ameliorative measures for residents affected by the scheme and for overall environmental mitigation and improvement:* This is still being sought despite responding on two separate occasions to the scoping exercises that the Highways Agency undertook.
- *Full reimbursement of County Council ongoing costs in maintaining de-trunked roads arising from the scheme:* Discussions on a framework need to begin.
- *Extension of the scheme to Quy.* The extension to be part of much longer term proposal to improve A14 eastwards. Widening is unlikely to be needed for the Eastern expansion of Cambridge, as a new link would have to be provided to Fen Ditton Interchange and dualling of Newmarket Road to Quy would be required.

3. SCHEME PROPOSALS

3.1 Since the Highways Agency appointed the “Joint Venture Consortium”, (JVC) comprising principally Messrs Costain, Skanska and Atkins as the Early Contractor Involvement contractor in February 2008, major advances in the scheme design and planned construction methods have been made. Local engagement has taken place with the Local Authorities, Parishes and land owners to understand local concerns except for some of the wider environmental impacts. This has helped in bringing forward a deliverable design although there are a number of outstanding issues which still need to be resolved.

3.2 The A14 scheme as proposed is understood to be the largest single scheme in the Highway Agency’s programme and its various elements, which follow the CHUMMS strategy, consist of:

- A new two lane dual carriageway between Ellington and Brampton (A1), with localised widening of the A1 to a three lane dual carriageway past Brampton,
- A new off- line three lane dual carriageway between Brampton and Fen Drayton,
- Widening of the existing A14 to three lanes in each direction between Fen Drayton and Fen Ditton,
- Local access roads between Fen Drayton and Girton to separate local from strategic traffic,
- Major free flow interchanges with the A1 at Brampton, with the existing A14 at Fen Drayton and with the M11/ A428 at Girton.
- The down grading of the A14 between Brampton Hut /Alconbury to Huntingdon and Huntingdon and Fen Drayton, with the removal of the Huntingdon Viaduct and provision of local town centre links.

- 3.3 Also, the County Council, as well as inheriting the new dual carriageway local access roads (circa 10 kms), will become responsible for new link roads in Huntingdon (circa 2 kms) and subject to negotiation, the de-trunked lengths of existing A14, (circa 20 kms). Associated with these de-trunked lengths will be liability for interchanges, drainage and landscaping.

4. TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE FINAL SCHEME

Design, Construction and Operational Matters

- 4.1 The design of the A14 highway works and their operational capacity will have to be to national design standards. The design of the local access roads, side road diversions and Huntingdon Town Centre links will also have to be to the same standards.
- 4.2 The scheme has been designed in line with the Government's Planning Policy Statement (PPS25) on Flooding and Development to accommodate a 1 in 100 year storm plus an allowance of 20% for climate change. Whilst it is understood that the design has been agreed in principle by the Environment Agency, the new UK Climate Change Projections 09 indicate that the intensity and severity of rainfall events may increase in future suggesting that the design could be insufficiently resilient for the longer term flooding requirements of the county.

Access to Northstowe

- 4.3 Ever since the location of Northstowe was identified as the prospective position of the Cambridge Sub-regional new settlement, the issues of comparative timing with the A14 improvement and the provision of adequate access capacity has been recognised. That issue still remains. The Highways Agency has limited powers under its order making ability to make provision for extra capacity for a major development that as yet does not have formal planning approval. In the event, a design has been evolved which can be extended when Northstowe receives its planning permission.

Huntingdon Town Centre

- 4.4 The removal of the Huntingdon viaduct will provide environmental improvements and offer the opportunity for redevelopment of the Town Centre. This proposal is welcomed by the District Council, which is promoting the expansion of the retail and civic roles of the Centre. The removal of the viaduct and linking of the old A14 route into the local road network will proportionately reduce travel distance and thus some traffic volumes within the Town.

Huntingdon West of Town Centre Link Road

- 4.5 This scheme, which will link George Street to Ermine Street in the Town Centre, is being promoted by Huntingdonshire District Council and site developers. Whilst the scheme is very helpful in improving traffic movement within the Town Centre, it is not crucial to the removal of the A14 viaduct, and

is not therefore included in the A14 proposals themselves, but could come forward as part of the Housing Growth Fund. The scheme received outline planning permission in November 2009.

Safety Audit

- 4.6 There are several stages of safety audit to be undertaken for the design and construction of the new roads including those that are to become County roads. The County Council will play an important role in this work for the County roads and this may give rise to some localised concerns and thus objections as detailed design is finalised. Unless the County Council is satisfied that the scheme complies with the safety audit procedures, it will not take over the local roads.
- 4.7 Concerns have been expressed about the suitability from a speed point of view, of the proposed “270 degree” loop at Bar Hill for Northstowe traffic travelling from the east and south. To ensure that a design can be achieved which will encourage and enable safe usage, the County Council’s own framework safety consultant was asked to offer a second opinion on how the network at this location can be developed to maximise safety. Their view is that with appropriate signing and lane markings, this arrangement can operate safely given the type and volume of traffic
- 4.8 The re-modelling of the Girton Interchange represents a major increase in the complexity of the highway network at that location. Six additional movements will have to be catered for to allow the wider separation of local and long distance traffic, and yet at this location there needs to be merging and diverging of these elements of traffic which will need to be facilitated through nationally accepted standards. At one location within the interchange the visibility, where two eastbound roads merge at the existing Huntingdon Road bridge, does not achieve national standards and this needs to be raised as an objection.

Public Rights of Way / Non Motorised Users (NMUs)

- 4.9 The Highways Agency and JVC have taken a reasonable approach to accommodating the needs of walkers, cyclists and equestrians along the off line section of the scheme. An exception is the issue of access between Brampton and Brampton Wood; here a strong case exists for a more direct link than that proposed via Park Road and Grafham Road, adding an unattractive 1.5kms to the direct route. The Highways Agency should be asked to review its position.
- 4.10 There will still be significant severance for walkers and equestrians along the on line section, which is caused by the existing lack of bridges crossing the road which is not proposed to change, but the designers have developed helpful route proposals parallel to the road to mitigate the severance. Issues with footpath and bridleway crossing of the future de-trunked sections will fall to the County Council to resolve. Some NMU issues are subject to further clarification, in particular the re-establishment of the bridleway to Longstanton, where the Side Roads Orders stop up an important connection.
- 4.11 The proposed local access roads will have a number of measures to provide

for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. An off road cycle route is proposed from Huntingdon Road, Cambridge to Bar Hill, which will link into Northstowe via a dedicated bridge for NMU users over the A14. A link for NMU users will be provided to Swavesey off line on the north side of the A14 and will continue as a bridleway to Fen Drayton. NMU users will be able to cross the A14 at Swavesey and the A1198 at Wood Green, and 2 Public footpath diversions will cross the A14 on new bridges at Conington.

Rest and Service Areas

- 4.12 Rest and Service areas have long been a valuable feature of the national motorways and trunk roads. It is regretted that the Highways Agency has not included the provision for rest area sites within the scope of the new scheme. The length of the A14 being improved represents one of the great cross roads of England, carrying a very significant volume of traffic making long distance journeys. Ideally, at least one new large scale rest area, located adjacent to the scheme could be well used. Therefore, the Agency must ensure that the signing of existing service areas is to a high standard. For example, routing from and to the main A14 to the Cambridge Services and also to the Brampton Hut Services which, located at the current junction of the A14 and the A1 should be clearly signed. Likewise, the location of any future lorry parking sites should be clearly identified.

Environmental Issues

- 4.13 The main source of environmental information is the Environmental Statement (ES) published with the draft Scheme Orders. This is an essential part of the appraisal and justification of the scheme covering various environmental topics.
- 4.14 Overall the scheme will have a major environmental impact and whilst it will deliver some beneficial impacts in certain areas e.g. air quality in Huntingdon there will also be negative impacts e.g. increased road traffic noise for some villages close to the proposed scheme. Some of these negative impacts have not been adequately addressed and the Agency needs to address these through provision of mitigation or compensatory measures, or further evidence to justify their position. For instance, provision of a “green bridge” where A14 proposals cut across the line of Silver Street/Pathfinder Long Distance Walk would help provide mitigation not only as enhancement of the landscape but also for biodiversity, amenity and climate change benefits. It would also demonstrate good practice and be in accordance with the Green Corridor Initiative No 30 (Godmanchester to Cambourne Corridor) identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge sub-region.
- 4.15 Extensive areas of existing vegetation will be lost through development of this scheme and although this will be compensated for, to some extent, by new planting there are concerns as to whether it will be in character with the local area and comply with the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines.
- 4.16 With the development of road improvement schemes there is often a trade-off between increases in emissions of greenhouse gases and improvement in air quality. A number of uncertainties about the emissions associated with this proposal exist and have not been fully quantified in the ES, e.g. carbon

emissions associated with the scheme operation and construction.

- 4.17 Whilst the ES assessment of noise generally follows the requirements of the Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and the mitigation included seems appropriate, there is insufficient information to assess whether the strategy will be achieved. In addition, no reference is made to the Environmental Noise Directive or the draft Noise Action Plans recently published by Defra.

A1198 Junction

- 4.18 An outstanding issue which Cabinet needs to address, is the merit of providing a half junction on the new A14 where it crosses the A1198. The original CHUMMS strategy called for a junction at this point. However, the initial Highways Agency consultation held in 2005 precluded any junction on the grounds that it would encourage use by local traffic. In May 2006, the County Council chose not to challenge that point and rejected a junction on the A1198. However, in the October 2007 preferred route announcement the Highways Agency included a possible half junction (with west facing slip roads) on the A1198, which has subsequently been consolidated into the scheme.
- 4.19 Further traffic information is now to hand which indicates that the provision of the half junction would enable longer distance traffic starting in the area access to the A14 rather than travelling through Huntingdon. Thus, this junction would offer further traffic relief for the centre of Huntingdon and Brampton, without detriment to Godmanchester. It would improve access to the Cardinal Business Park in Godmanchester. There is also the potential for some traffic from St Ives to avoid the A1123 when travelling west bound to the A14. There would in any event be a significant reduction in traffic volume in the future on the A1198 because of the A14 improvement scheme itself will attract rat running traffic currently using the A1198.

Archaeological Issues

- 4.20 Officers repeatedly expressed concern to the Highways Agency about the initial lack of field investigation and the consequent exclusion of intelligent mitigation strategies for archaeology that could be included in the Environment Statement. This work element covers the whole of the scheme including new roads/ off-site structures and other supporting elements of the scheme (e.g. borrow pits, to be covered by numerous separate planning applications). Although a very limited programme of physical evaluation is underway at present on the new off-line route, the results of this work have not yet been submitted. The evaluation results of the full route are critical for the design and timetabling of appropriate mitigation strategies that will respond to construction impacts, and to the successful management and implementation of this scheme. While the limited field evaluations have demonstrated the presence of extensive multi-period archaeological site remains, they have not yet revealed sites of national importance that would significantly constrain or prevent the construction of the new route, which is therefore unopposed on historic environment grounds subject to the provision for, and implementation of, suitable mitigation strategies.

- 4.21 There is considered to be a major adverse impact of the project on the setting of two Scheduled Ancient Monuments (afforded statutory protection) and the Conservation Area in Huntingdon. This includes the cumulative impact of the proposed links, the “Pathfinder Link” and the George Street-Railway car park part of the Mill Common link, on other significant undesignated buried remains and ancient earthworks. There will also be a serious impact of the proposed link roads and the three roundabouts on the views across the ancient commons. The Highways Agency has not justified this part of the scheme design in terms of its archaeological impacts nor those on the designated Conservation Area. Moreover, the proposals for temporary works: storage of construction equipment, soil stores, car parks and compounds on the sensitive landscape of Mill Common during construction are not acceptable.
- 4.22 The Agency must measure the scheme design against the proposed destruction of both protected and preserved aspects of the historic environment both at Mill Common and the neighbouring Views Common. The Agency needs to indicate how the balance of intrusion versus environmental gain anticipated from the removal of the viaduct is addressed. The Agency must provide a full and detailed justification for the need, location and design of these links, which are more damaging than those proposed in the Agency’s 2008 Scoping Report.

Minerals and Waste Implications

- 4.23 In relation to the mineral and waste requirements for the A14 upgrade, the JVC has estimated a need for approximately 7 million tonnes of material for the works. To deal with some of this large construction requirement they put forward nine new borrow pit sites for clay extraction (eight with general fill) and one existing waste site (suitable for the over digging of clay) as part of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan Preferred Options 2 consultation. These proposals were in addition to a number of sites for sand and gravel extraction and an aggregate railhead put forward by the minerals industry and landowners. The proposals put forward by the JVC were subject to an informal ‘additional sites’ consultation in January 2009 for a six week period. The comments received on these proposals were then used to inform the next stage of the Plan.
- 4.24 The Submission Plan and allocated sites for the scheme were approved by the County Council on 13 October 2009 to allow the documents to go out for a formal six week consultation in February / March 2010 before submission to the Secretary of State.
- 4.25 The Submission Plan includes six borrow pit sites for the A14 in terms of sand and gravel and nine borrow pit sites for the A14 in terms of clay extraction. Apart from hard rock, which will need to be imported into the area, (potentially to a local railhead) the objective is for the A14 upgrade, in relation to minerals and waste, to be virtually self-sufficient, thereby reducing the need to transport bulk construction materials on the public highway through local communities.
- 4.26 The Environmental Statement (ES) assumes that many materials for the scheme will be sourced from borrow pits adjacent to the scheme and other

nearby designated areas (such as aggregate railheads). Most of those borrow pit areas and a replacement aggregate railhead have been included in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Submission Plan but at this stage there is no absolute guarantee that such sources will be made available as they are reliant on future individual planning applications which would need to address excavation, operational and after use issues. In policy terms the borrow pit sites would not normally be considered suitable for excavation, but for their proximity to the line of the scheme. There is no alternative scenario testing in the ES should consent not be given and no indication of the potential scale of impacts in the local area should this be the case. The ES is deficient in this respect but there is no reason why additional information should not be made available prior to any Inquiry.

Legal Orders, including County Roads

- 4.27 The Cabinet in May 2006, requested that the Highways Agency take forward the Statutory Orders necessary to build all of the elements of the scheme. The Highways Agency has completed the main design of the scheme, produced an Environmental Statement and is seeking a range of orders principally under the Highways Act 1980. It is understood that other powers related to drainage works will also be required.
- 4.28 In support of the A14 improvements, the County Council would need to make various traffic regulation orders (TROs). To facilitate the effective operation of a series of new local roads within Huntingdon, which will become county roads in due course, it will be necessary to introduce a series of TROs to control parking, to restrict certain vehicle movements and to manage vehicle speeds as well as heavy commercial vehicle access.
- 4.29 The existing TRO for the bus lane on Huntingdon Road in Girton will need to be modified in response to the A14 proposals for Girton interchange.
- 4.30 It is recommended that Cabinet supports consultation on and formal advertisement of these TROs which would take place in the spring 2010. As part of this process, the relevant Area Joint Committee (AJC) would be consulted. Any objections to the advertised TROs would then be referred to Cabinet.
- 4.31 The precise scope of the TROs is still subject to detailed work with the JVC. Therefore, it is suggested that the Cabinet member for Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Executive Director for Environment Services be delegated responsibility for approving the scope of the TROs.
- 4.32 Cabinet would have the option of directly determining any TRO objections or calling a public inquiry to consider the objections, which could be held concurrently with the anticipated public inquiry into the A14 proposals. This would achieve some alignment of these processes. Cabinet could then consider the findings of the TRO public inquiry once the findings from any public inquiry into the A14 proposals are known.

Construction Traffic Routes

- 4.33 Some early discussions have taken place with the JVC to determine their

intended approach to directing their construction traffic, bearing in mind their objectives of self sufficiency in materials or the claiming of materials adjacent to the site. General fill for embankment, and sands and gravels are proposed to be sourced adjacent to the scheme. Haul roads for these materials are included in the scheme proposals removing the need for using existing roads for substantial quantities of material. Hard rock, concrete and coated, and other general material will be delivered to site using only the M11, A1, A14, A428 and A1198 routes. Use of all other county roads for delivery will not be permitted. However, more detailed discussions are needed as to the mechanism of how these restrictions will be enforced.

Construction Phasing

- 4.34 Officers have had initial discussions with the JVC about how the construction works will be phased. It is intended that the Girton to Fen Drayton section will be constructed in the first phase. Inevitably, with a major construction project of this scale, some level of disruption to traffic is unavoidable but it will be important that this is minimised as much as is practically possible. There may be some periods during which some routes for local traffic are restricted. Forward planning with clear communications will need to be managed carefully with close working between Local Authorities and the JVC.

Emergency Routing

- 4.35 Discussions between the County Council’s Traffic Manager and the Highways Agency on proposed emergency routing as a consequence of the construction of the new A14 have progressed. One issue involving a length of the A1 remains to be resolved. However, a solution has been proposed to the Highways Agency, but it is not included in the current proposals.

5. TAKING MATTERS FORWARD

- 5.1 The following is the Highways Agency’s anticipated timetable for completion of the scheme:

Date	Stage
2009 September	Publish Draft orders
2010 “Summer”	Public Inquiry (if required)
2011	Secretary of State’s decision
2012 “Spring”	Start of Works
2013-16	Opening in stages.

- 5.2 Because the County Council is inevitably involved in this major scheme as the Local Highway Authority and Waste and Minerals Planning Authority, it will have to formally engage at different stages, although officers will liaise throughout this period. Additionally, if the Flooding and Water Management Bill 2009, becomes law before the Public Inquiry, the County Council will become vested with significant new duties and powers especially for flooding within Cambridgeshire. This means that it will have to satisfy itself that works associated with this scheme will not be detrimental to the current drainage regime and that it has sufficient resilience to cater for catchment run off under the recently revised national advice on periodic storm water flows.

Additionally, that the storm water retention facilities of the scheme itself, including balancing ponds, drains and pipes have sufficient capacity to meet the demands of such events.

- 5.3 In the short term, Cabinet has to critically comment via a series of objections on the proposed scheme now that scheme's draft orders have been published. The recommendations of this Cabinet meeting will form the basis of the Council's position at the Public Inquiry next summer. In respect of objections, it is almost certain that it will be possible to negotiate away some of the objections before the Public Inquiry.
- 5.4 Representation at the Inquiry is required because the Secretary of State will be promoting concurrent orders for the new trunk road works and the de-trunking, as well as the new local access roads and new roads in Huntingdon.

6. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS FOR MEMBER INFORMATION

Resources and Performance:

- 6.1 There are significant implications for the County Council in respect of the additional lengths of de-trunked highway, new local access roads and new links in Huntingdon. However, Cabinet has previously resolved to seek full reimbursement by Government of maintenance costs arising from this scheme. This would include the maintenance of drainage systems and landscaping as well maintenance of the roads themselves.
- 6.2 The costs of representation at the anticipated public Inquiry will need to be funded by the County Council and is included in the budget through the Integrated Plan Process. Costs will also be incurred in gathering evidence and in negotiations with the Highways Agency and others.
- 6.3 The processing of individual planning applications for mineral borrow pits for the A14 and their monitoring during implementation will generate a significant workload for the Council's Minerals and Waste planning team. Both planning application and the monitoring fees will be payable to the County Council.
- 6.4 The risks associated with this scheme have previously been reported to Cabinet. In essence, the Highways Agency is taking the primary risk associated with finance and delivery of the total scheme. A risk nevertheless remains for the Local Authorities through non-delivery or delay. This could be caused by any escalation in the overall cost of the scheme and limited or lack of national funding. The Highways Agency's Consultants and Contractors who form the Joint Venture Consortium (JVC) have only been contracted to build the on-line Fen Drayton to Histon Section of the scheme. The other two sections remain to be tendered.
- 6.5 However, the A14 scheme between Ellington and Fen Ditton does form one of the great cross roads of England where it intersects both the A1 and the M11. Here the A14 needs to perform more effectively through a reduction in accidents, incidents and general traffic congestion which is in the interests of the national economy. It is difficult to believe this is not fully recognised by Central Government.

Statutory Requirements and Partnership Working:

- 6.6 The County Council will become the legal highway authority for the de-trunked and new local roads. The County Council will have to continue to work with Highways Agency on matters associated with signing and routing and to liaise to ensure that the new local roads are designed and constructed to the desired standard. Agreement with the Department for Transport will need to be reached on the individual route numbering and classification of the new local roads as this can influence the level of on-going maintenance grant received in future.

Climate Change:

- 6.7 The existing A14 is chronically congested with many hours of traffic delay experienced daily. Congestion can lead to greater CO₂ emissions and other air pollutants compared to the equivalent free-flow traffic. CHUMMS recognised that by providing the Guided Busway to improve public transport and by providing improvements to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail line to cater for modern container traffic from the East Coast Ports would offer some traffic relief. However, the only pragmatic approach to ameliorating the traffic congestion was through the increasing of the traffic capacity of the A14. Nevertheless, the new Flooding and Water Management duties that are in prospect for the County Council means that it must assure itself that the drainage regime proposed by the scheme is sufficiently resilient to meet foreseeable storm and likely increased rainfall needs in the long term.
- 6.8 There are obvious economic benefits from reducing congestion on the A14. However, there is evidence from studies looking at improved traffic flow (such as recent study conducted on the M42), to suggest that any reductions in emissions from the avoidance of stationary and stop/start traffic are outweighed by the additional emissions from traffic travelling at higher speeds. Additionally, any extra induced traffic occurring as a result of the improved capacity would exacerbate this situation.
- 6.9 The scheme itself would reduce traffic congestion for local and long distance traffic currently travelling on the A14 and as a wider impact, reduce rat running through local villages. However this could result in additional emissions from local traffic travelling at higher speeds on the A14. Additional growth in the local area and across the region will also lead to increased traffic and higher emissions.

Access and Inclusion:

- 6.10 In terms of access and inclusion, the A14 scheme has to be seen as part of the multi-modal strategy for the corridor. The Guided Busway, which complements the highway scheme, will link three of the four most deprived Wards in Cambridgeshire with current and prospective future employment sites, education establishments and town and community centre facilities. This is a significant feature in access and inclusion policy.

Engagement and Consultation:

- 6.11 The Highways Agency and the JVC have been heavily involved in public consultation and made strenuous efforts to engage at the local level, in particular at Parish level, throughout the design of the scheme. There have been six sets of consultation and exhibitions about the A14 and its associated works, conducted by the Highways Agency and the Local Authorities. The County Council's liaison has focused on Member participation at Divisional or Parish level. There have also been numerous Member meetings and briefings and some joint briefings with District Councils.

Source Documents	Location
<p>CHUMMS Report, DfT. 2001.</p> <p>Preferred Route Announcements (27/3/07 & 24/10/07) Consultation Documentation</p> <p>A0 Plans of Scheme Proposals (11/08)</p> <p>County Council Cabinet Agendas and Minutes (25/9/01, 14/6/05, 23/5/06 27/2/07)</p> <p>Statements of Support for A14 scheme organised by the County Council (7/05 & 3/07)</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cambridge Sub-Region, Cambridgeshire Horizons, 5/06 (website document)</p> <p>Advanced Motorway Signalling and Traffic Management Study. DfT 3/08 (website document)</p> <p>Agenda and Minutes of the Growth and Environment Policy Development Group, 27th January 2009.</p> <p>A14 Ellington to Fen Ditton Improvement Scheme, Draft Orders and Environmental Statement. Highways Agency,. September 2009.</p> <p>Agenda and Minutes, Growth and Environment Policy Development Group. 11/11/09</p> <p>(PPS 25) Planning Policy Statement "Development and Flood Risk"</p> <p>UKCIP09 drainage design criteria, 2009</p>	<p>A copy of the County Council source documents is kept in the Transport Policy and Strategy Service, Room 2A1, Castle Court Shire Hall.</p>

THE SCOPE OF OBJECTIONS TO THE A14 DRAFT SCHEME ORDERS

Alongside overall support for the scheme, the following sets out the scope of the objections that are made to the draft Orders, as per recommendation 2 and 7. (Note: the objection is in bold and further detail and explanation is in italics).

1. **The need for the reinstatement of a direct bridleway link between Brampton Village and Brampton Wood.** *This measure would re-create a long standing recreational facility that was removed when the A1 was dualled during the 1980s. The Parish Council has campaigned for this proposal. It is understood that the Agency has suggested that this proposal should be tested at Public Inquiry.*
2. **The need for re-establishment of bridleway link to Longstanton.** *Longstanton Bridleway 10 originally connected across the A14 (previously A604) through Bar Hill and on to Dry Drayton. When the road was dualled, the route was effectively diverted to cross using the Hattons Road Bridge. The A14 Side Road Orders shows this connection being severed by the partial stopping up of Bridleway 10 with no connection to the local access road being shown, leaving only a connection to the Oakington junction. The Ramblers association and Parish Council both expressed concern about severing this connection.*
3. **The need for improved pedestrian facilities leading to Hinchingbrooke Park Road from Brampton Road in Huntingdon.** *The lack of a suitably designed crossing for school children appears to be an omission from the draft Orders and an amendment for this provision is required.*
4. **It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the scheme as currently proposed overcomes the design safety concerns where two eastbound roads merge at the existing Huntingdon Road bridge within the Girton Interchange.** *Further issues of design may arise during the detailed design and construction phases on the local roads, and the County Council seeks assurance from the Highways Agency that these matters would be rectified to the County Council's satisfaction.*
5. **The need to confirm the payment of de-trunking costs and classifications.** *To date, discussions with the Highways Agency have not included re-imburement for costs involved in the work that will be needed to bring the maintained standard of those lengths of existing Trunk Road which will be de-trunked up to adoptable standard. In the short term a framework for such discussions would be appropriate as the transfer of responsibility is some years away and the condition of the heavily used roads will change over that time. Discussions will need to include responsibilities for maintenance of joint drainage, lighting, landscaping and signing. Separate from these discussions is the dialogue necessary between the County Council and the Department for Transport about the future classifications of the de trunked roads and the new local access roads as this will influence the level of Revenue Support Grant that the*

County Council will receive for maintenance costs in the future following adoption by the County Council. The new local access roads will be built to the County Council's specification as a condition of adoption.

6. **The need to agree emergency routeing of trunk road traffic.**
Negotiations with the Highways Agency over the emergency diversionary routing of Trunk Road Traffic in the instances of temporary road closure have been largely successful. However, there is one outstanding instance involving partial closure of the A1 near Brampton. Until that matter is resolved an objection should remain for unacceptable congestion and safety reasons on local roads.
7. **The lack of inclusion of an all movements Junction at Girton.** *This is a long standing aspiration intended to ameliorate local village intrusion, and for the future regional growth agenda. CHUMMS did recommend a review of these movements, but the subsequent London and South Midlands Multi-Modal Study introduced the proposal for M11 widening and upgrading of the A428/ A421. As a consequence, the Highways Agency brief for the A14 scheme did not include addressing these longer distance movements.*
8. **The lack of an extension of the scheme from Fen Ditton to Quy Interchange.** *This is an aim for the longer term Regional Growth agenda. It was part of the London and South Midlands Multi-modal Study and accepted by the Secretary of State as part of a longer term plan.*
9. **The uncertainty over the sources of materials.** *The Environmental Statement (ES) assumes that many materials for the scheme will be sourced from borrow pits adjacent to the scheme and other nearby designated areas. Those sites have been included for consultation in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste draft Submission Plan for consultation early next year before submission to the Secretary of State but at this stage there is no guarantee that such sources will be made available. The majority of these sites would not be considered for excavation, but for their proximity to the line of the scheme. Their suitability will also depend on the proposed afteruse. There is no alternative scenario testing in the ES should consent not be given and no indication of the potential scale of impacts should this be the case. That testing should include economic, social and environmental impacts.*
10. **It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that environmental issues at some locations along the route have been appropriately addressed through mitigation and/or compensatory measures.** *For example, these issues include*
 - *a visual assessment following DMRB guidelines will be undertaken to assess significance of visual effects;*
 - *new planting will be designed to be in character with the local area and comply with the Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines;*
 - *whether landscape proposals will integrate with surroundings to reduce the impact of the junctions, interchanges and lighting columns e.g. on the noise bund at Brampton;*
 - *whether the off-site planting proposed adjacent to the viaduct (necessary for landscape mitigation and integration) will be secured;*

- *where habitat loss will affect bird breeding species e.g. nightingale, grasshopper warbler, cettis warbler and lapwin, opportunities will be explored for suitable habitat creation in the biodiversity mitigation areas or in the habitat creation/landscaping areas surrounding water features;*
 - *biodiversity mitigation areas will provide habitat suitable for species identified on the S41 list of Habitats & Species of Principal Importance (Natural & Rural Communities Act 2006);*
 - *a monitoring programme of 10 years (rather than 5) is undertaken to ensure the effective establishment of all the biodiversity mitigation areas and landscaping (this would be in line with that for the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway).*
11. **It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that noise issues along the route have been adequately addressed through sufficient mitigation.** *For example, whether there is sufficient mitigation from increased traffic noise for some villages adjacent to the scheme and for night time noise (which does not appear to have been considered). Additionally, the ES does not contain reference to the Environmental Noise Directive and the implications this may have for the scheme.*
12. **The need to address Air Quality and CO₂ emissions.** *Whilst the scheme will result in greater vehicle usage through increased traffic volumes and travel distance there will be some net benefit to local air quality e.g. in Huntingdon. However, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that air quality and CO₂ emissions have been appropriately addressed through mitigation and compensatory measures. There are concerns about increased emissions in some areas such as north of Cambridge and, in particular, the scheme hindering government policies to reduce carbon emissions. The ES does not provide a comprehensive understanding of carbon emissions associated with the scheme's operation and construction or consideration of measures that could be incorporated to help reduce these impacts.*
13. **It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the issues in relation to drainage capacity and flooding mitigation have been adequately addressed.** *Following publication of the Pitt Report on "Learning Lessons on the 2007 Floods", the Government has introduced new responsibilities for Shire Authorities under its Flooding and Water Management Bill, which is likely to be enacted by the end of March 2010. The potential new responsibilities will require the County Council, among many new duties, to oversee and scrutinise the drainage impact of major schemes like the A14. The new UK Climate Projections 09 (UKCP09) developed by the UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP) and the Met Office, indicate that the intensity and severity of precipitation events may increase in future. Thus, there are potential concerns over resilience of the proposed scheme's drainage system under more extreme weather in the future. Despite the scheme's drainage system complying with the current advice in PPS 25, and agreement in principle with the Environment Agency, a more precautionary approach is required*
14. **Insufficient Green Infrastructure.** *The County Council has previously sought the provision of green bridge facilities on the line of the Silver Street bridleway where it crosses the new A14. The Cambridge sub region*

Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies a green corridor between Godmanchester and Cambourne along the line of Silver Street, and it would be appropriate for the proposed bridleway bridge to be constructed as a green bridge to provide landscape and biodiversity links across the new road.

15. **It has not been adequately demonstrated that the issues in relation to further archaeological mitigation especially in Huntingdon have been adequately addressed.** *Current field evaluations conducted in limited areas of the proposed new route have not yet revealed sites of national importance and that the new route is therefore unopposed on historic environment grounds. This is subject to the provision for and implementation of suitable mitigation strategies. There is considered to be a major impact of the project on the setting of Ancient Monuments and the Conservation Area in Huntingdon. This includes the impact of the proposed links – the “Pathfinder Link” and the George Street-Railway car park link on significant buried remains and earthworks, and the views across the ancient commons. The Highways Agency has not justified the scheme design in terms of its archaeological impacts or those to the designated Conservation Area. Despite repeated requests for discussions, the Highways Agency has failed to engage with the County archaeologists over this specific area. Also, the proposals for storage of construction equipment, materials and other temporary works on Mill Common during construction are not acceptable.*
16. **Objections to the modifications to the bridge works over the Guided Busway.** *An Officer objection has already been submitted to protect the immediate interests of the County Council as the Statutory Guided Busway Authority during current negotiations.*
17. **The need for improved pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities at Histon and Fen Ditton Interchanges.** *The County Council wishes to improve the safety of cyclists crossing the A14 en-route for Cambridge. The assistance of the Highways Agency in providing improved crossings of slip roads is needed. At Histon, a study is underway examining alternative crossing facilities, and higher parapet railings would be required on the Fen Ditton Bridge.*
18. **The need for positive signing to existing and new service and rest areas.** *The Agency must ensure that the signing of existing service areas is to a high standard. For example, routing from and to the main A14 to the Cambridge Services and also to the Brampton Hut Services which located at the current junction of the A14 and the A1 should be clearly signed. This should include any future lorry parking sites which come into operation.*

A14Cab151209afin3